



Meeting Summary

The Design Review Panel met virtually on **Thursday November 9th, 2023** via WebEx.

Panel Members Present:

David Clusiau, *Chair*

Dayna Edwards
Jennifer Sisson

Jennifer Mallard

Joey Giaimo
Ted Watson

Staff Present:

Jana Kelemen, Manager of Heritage and Urban Design
Michael Vortuba, SPM Heritage and Design

Edward Winter, Planner 1-Urban Design
Jennifer Catarino, Area Planning Manager

Others Present

Presentation #3	Mike Crough , Arcadis Ritee Haider , Arcadis	Wayne Harrison , KNYMH Architects
------------------------	---	--

Regrets:

Eldon Theodore

Declaration of Interest:

PANEL MEMBERS ONLY - NONE

Schedule:

Start Time	Address	Type of Application	Applicant/ Agent	City Staff Planner
1:30 pm	Residential Development 50 Creighton Rd, Dundas	Zoning By-Law Amendments	Owner: Performance Investments GP Inc. c/o Derek Conorton Agent and Presentation: Arcadis	Jennifer Catarino

Summary of Comments:

Note: The Design Review Panel is strictly an advisory body and makes recommendations to Planning Division staff. These comments should be reviewed in conjunction with all comments received by commenting agencies and should be discussed with Planning Division staff prior to resubmission.

50 Creighton Road

Development Proposal Overview

The proposed development is to demolish the existing building and to construct a 12-storey residential condominium with 168 dwelling units, 204 parking spaces (62 above ground spaces and 142 underground spaces), 124 bicycle spaces, 205 lockers, and 726 m² of rooftop amenity space.

Key Questions to the Panel from Planning Staff

- Does the proposed development build upon the established patterns and built form of the neighbourhood, and demonstrate an understanding of the character of place, context as well as sensitivity to public and private spaces?
- Does the proposal consider the relationship of height, massing, and scale of the surrounding area, and provide appropriate transitions in scale that reflect the existing built and natural environments?
- Does the proposal complement the existing function of the neighbourhood and contribute to connectivity to support modes of public and active transportation?
- Does the proposal include design features that promote the reductions of greenhouse gas emissions and other sustainable design features?
- Does the proposal adequately incorporate the Linkage into the design to retain the aesthetic and environmental qualities of Spencer Creek, and maintain public access to the Spencer Creek Trail, and the Mill Street Open Space Area?
- Does the Proposal conserve, maintain and enhance the natural heritage and topographic features of the site and area?

Panel Comments and Recommendations

a) Overview and Response to Context

The panel had concerns over the proposed height and scale of the building overwhelming the buildable portion of the site. There was also a noted concern over the proportion of 1-bedroom units.

The panel noted the parking ratio seemed high for a urban-type proposal, and questioned if there was a misalignment with the proposal and context.

b) Built Form and Character

The panel had concerns over the opaque podium – with very little connection to the street or pedestrian realm. The panel noted the location along the creek brought nature very close to the building – an amenity that is not being taken advantage of with the proposed design with parking dominating the ground and 2nd levels.

The panel also had concerns over the selection of EIFS (stucco) finish, and questioned the longevity of the building not matching the potential lifespan of a building of this stature.

c) Site Layout and Circulation

The panel noted a desire for more ground-related design that connected residents and guests to the natural character of the site. This could be improved with increased transparency at ground level, with amenity spaces or residential units.

d) Streetscape, The Pedestrian Realm & Landscape Strategy

The site is divided by a creek with the proposed building on one side – with a trail connection at the west corner and continuing along the north portion. The panel appreciated the continued provision of the bridge and trail connection, the panel felt there was a general lack of connection to the pedestrian realm.

The panel also noted the importance of landscape design across the entire site noting the creek on one side of the proposed building and a treed ravine on the other side both give strong opportunities to use the natural environment towards amenity space, but also bring cautions with set-backs (to the natural features), and importance of selecting native species – and those that will work with the existing natural features.

Summary

In general, the panel felt the development proposal was too big for the site and included too much parking – and offered that a revision to a lower building could reduce those pressures and give space to do more with the unique qualities of the site.

The panel would like to see more interaction on the ground level, with more transparency into the building at grade to leverage the natural environment and to use this connection to the site as a design tool.

The panel felt the proposed building (tower) looked formulaic in contrast to the unique site/property, and the panel felt there was opportunity for revisions to the height and layout on-site which could make the proposal more successful.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.